REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 23, 2003, Applicants have further

modified the claims. Applicants submit that these Remarks along with the accompanying

Amendments to the Claims overcome the rejections set forth by the Examiner in the above

referenced Office Action.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth

under 35 U.S.C. Sections 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art

references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or

suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention.

More specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite the

novel structure of the device. Applicants have previously attempted to describe the visual

position of the invention's elements, and hope the amended claims make the invention clearer

to the Examiner. Applicants have made use of the term "primary wall" to describe the four

main side walls that form a rectangular shape, and embody the dimensions of almost all

variations of the current invention. While package designers are at will to implement any

shape of package, the most common shape is rectangular, and is the shape to which

Applicant's invention is currently directed. The use of cut or other shaped corners (See

Figure 2A of Applicant's disclosure for an example of cut and rounded corners) does not

detract from the predominately rectangular shape of the device.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, and 5 in order to more clearly disclose the

page 5 of 8

Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2003

claimed shape of the device. The amended language of the claims reads as "a housing

containing a semiconductor element, said housing having primary side walls." This

arrangement describes a rectangular-shaped package with four primary sidewalls, such that

they are divided into 2 sets of 2 primary sidewalls. Within each set, the two sidewalls make

up opposite ends of the rectangular shape, such that the two sidewalls are parallel to each

other. The two sidewalls in one of the sets are perpendicular to the two side walls in the other

set, hence describing a rectangular shape. This description allows for any number of

secondary sidewalls that must be formed at the corners of the device. While these secondary

sidewalls may detract ever so slightly from the overall rectangular shape of the device,

simply extending each set of primary sidewalls beyond the secondary sidewalls until they

intersect would in fact complete the rectangle.

Applicant's claim the layout of the positioning and attaching holes in relation to the

structure described above. More specifically, the lines drawn through each set of holes,

attaching and positioning, intersect substantially in the center of the device, and are skewed in

relation to all four primary sidewalls. To put it another way, the lines drawn through each set

of holes are neither perpendicular nor parallel to any one of the four primary sidewalls. Arai

fails this test because when a line is drawn between the attaching holes in Figures 1 and 4

(described in Column 9, line 64 to Column 10, line 62), the resulting line would not be

skewed in relation to the sidewalls, but would in fact be parallel to one of the sidewalls and

be perpendicular to the other sidewall.

The traditional limitation of centering one of these holes, as disclosed in Figure 3 of

page 6 of 8

6/23/64

Applicant's invention and Figures 1 and 4 of the *Arai* reference, prevents the further miniaturization of the device by allowing for wasted space on the housing. The requirement of placing the hole in the center in the Prior Art was to make screw fastening torque uniform (See Applicant's disclosure, pg. 3). Applicant's have, however, invented a way to offset the holes from center and still maintain the integrity of the device.

Applicants submit that the references of record fail to teach or suggest such a structure. Accordingly, Applicants submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Robert J. Depke

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC

131 S. Dearborn, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor Chicago, Illinois 60603

**Tel: (312) 263-3600 Attorney for Applicant** 

Appl. No. 09/909,597 Amdt. Dated June 23, 2004 Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2003

## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States

Postal Service as First Class Mail on

23/04 in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop -Fee Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Attorney for Applicants